

A N

IMPARTIAL ACCOUNT

OF THE

DISPUTE

BETWEEN

Sir THOMAS BEEVOR, BART.

AND

JOHN MONEY, Esq.

LATE MAJOR IN THE NINTH REGIMENT OF FOOT;

WITH

OBSERVATIONS THEREUPON.

*Non ab isto convisiari pudet; sed fas apertè loqui, com-
minatus licet formidine fustis.*

PRINTED AND SOLD BY P. GEDGE, JUN. BURY,
AND N^o 10, COCKEY-LANE, NORWICH.

SOLD ALSO BY KIRKMAN AND ONEY, N^o 79, FLEET-STREET,
LONDON.—1788.

[PRICE ONE SHILLING.]

876
4

OF THE

DISPUTES

BETWEEN

ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL



JOHN H. M.

THE MUSEUM IN THE YEAR 1878

OBSERVATIONS ON THE

THESE OBSERVATIONS ARE THE PROPERTY OF THE
MUSEUM AND ARE NOT TO BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT
THE PERMISSION OF THE MUSEUM

PRINTED AND SOLD BY THE
AND M. COCKE, LONDON

SOLD ALSO BY KIRKMAN AND ONLY IN THE
LONDON - 1878

PRICE ONE SHILLING

A N

IMPARTIAL ACCOUNT, &c.

THE public attention having for some weeks past been engaged, in consequence of the dispute subsisting between Sir Thomas Beevor, Bart. of Hethel; and John Money, Esq. of Trowse; and no other, except imperfect and mutilated accounts of that affair having hitherto made their appearance in the newspapers, it may not perhaps be deemed uninteresting, to indulge the curiosity, or improper to satisfy the doubts which have arisen in the minds of many people during the progress of this extraordinary business, which, from a trivial absurdity, has been magnified into an object of importance.

In doing this, the author of these pages, however convinced in his own opinion he may be, as to the intrinsic merits of the case, will endeavour, by an exact detail of circumstances, and by a brief and candid consideration of them, to avoid that bias of partiality, which is apt too

B

frequently

frequently to influence the pen of a predetermined writer. And that the connection of circumstances may be as little interrupted as possible, a strict attention will be paid to the date of each letter, which will be inserted in the exact order in which it was written, and so interwoven with the thread of the discourse, as to challenge the comprehension of the most moderate understanding.—But in order to a serious and radical investigation of this matter, it will be found necessary to direct an enquiry into the origin, and if practicable, to derive the cause of the dispute to a more probable fountain than that, which has hitherto been held up to the public inspection. For it appears extraordinary, that without some previous circumstances of suspicion which might lead to it, Mr. Money should be induced to fix the fabrication of a libel upon Sir Thomas Bevor, or that the Baronet should adopt that mode of attack, in preference to a more open and explicit one, which it is not to be doubted, he could, and dared to have done.

To establish this point, I shall just refresh the memory of my readers with what has already been the subject of general conversation throughout the limits of the county of Norfolk, viz. That the equivocal and mysterious conduct which Mr. M. observed during the late contest for the city of Norwich, notwithstanding the partial declaration which

he

he had made in Sir Thomas Beevor's favour by his appearance in his Committee Room, was the cause of great umbrage to that gentleman in particular, and to his friends in general.—What cause Sir Thomas Beevor had to be disappointed at this conduct, or what motives Mr. M. had to act in the manner he did, is not for me to explain in this place; it must be left to the judgement of those, who are so well acquainted with the degree of intimacy which had long subsisted between the two parties, and the many particular claims that the one had upon the friendship of the other.—Hence, however, arose a marked reserve which did not fail to manifest its effects in due season.—Matters remained in this state until some time about Michaelmas 1787; when Mr. M. received a severe rebuke from Sir Thomas Beevor, and another gentleman, in consequence of an attempt made by him to alter an established meeting of the Justices of the Peace, held at Long Stratton, to a situation more commodious for himself and his associates, and this in a manner (in their opinion) not strictly justifiable or honourable.

How far these causes may have operated to increase the misunderstanding, is best known to Mr. M. Certain it is, however, that before the libel, as it is called, which is the present object of disquiet, had made its appearance, he had

conceived an unworthy suspicion of Sir Thomas Beevor.—For notwithstanding in page 5 of his Appeal to the Public, speaking of the atrocious libel which was published, he says, “ of the quarter from whence so malevolent a composition came, I could not *by any conjecture form an idea*, till accidentally I met the publisher of the Bury paper;” yet he undoubtedly had, previous to that period, declared his suspicion that it was the production of Sir Thomas Beevor’s pen.

WHAT inducement he could have to justify so vague an idea, I do not presume even to guess at; but from the most authentic documents I can affirm, that until the advertisement signed “Lowden*” appeared in the Bury paper, Sir Thomas Beevor was as much a stranger to it as Mr. M. himself could be.—From a serious consideration, then, of the circumstances which have been advanced, this inference is naturally obvious; that notwithstanding the manuscript alluded to having accidentally fallen into Mr. M.’s hands, yet it is more than probable, the cause of uneasiness may be deduced from a deeper source.

* This advertisement related to an information which Mr. Money had caused to be lodged against the son of Mr. Lowden, his neighbour, for shooting on his father’s estate at Trowse, to which he is the immediate heir; and which property is more than sufficient for a legal qualification.

BUT

BUT to proceed:—On Monday, October 29, 1787, an absurd manuscript of general tendency, but which Mr. Money has unaccountably claimed to himself, fell into his possession.

THE method by which this happened, has been so variously, and contradictorily stated to the public, that it is utterly impossible to reconcile the difference which subsists between the two assertions, so as to reduce them in any degree to the standard of truth.—Mr. M. affirms, *with a profusion of encomiums on the propriety of Mr. Gedge*, that it was brought to him voluntarily by that gentleman, upon a conviction of the malevolence of its tendency.—This is plausible enough; but,—*audi alteram partem*.—Mr. Gedge asserts, and the authenticity of his testimony he is willing to seal upon the holy evangelists, that the following was the mode by which it was obtained from him.

NORWICH, Dec. 27, 1787.

“ I Peter Gedge, of St. Peter Mancroft, in the city of Norwich, do hereby declare, that the paper alluded to by Major Money, in his dispute with Sir Thomas Beavor, was brought to me by Mr. John Lowden, of this parish.

“ AND I do further declare, that the above-mentioned paper was obtained from me in the following manner, by Major Money:—

I went

"I went (as is my weekly custom) to Alderman Kerrison's house, to collect intelligence for the Norwich and Bury Post. There I accidentally met Major Money, who, after I had been a short time in the room, began, in a violent passion to abuse me for inserting what he called an infamous libel upon his character; that he had taken the best legal advice upon the subject; and that, in consequence, he intended, to commence a prosecution against me. I assured the Major that I had no intention to injure his character; that what I had done was official; and that the paper in question (if libellous) came to me from a respectable person, in form of an advertisement, to whom he might refer. As a proof of the rectitude of my intentions, I told him, I had then in my possession a paper, which was brought to me from the same quarter from whence the former came; which, however, I did not mean to have published. Major Money earnestly requested a sight of this paper, and assured me that if I would so far oblige him, he should ever retain a high sense of the favour; and in the most solemn manner passed his honour to return it into my possession as soon as he had perused it.

"RELYING upon the fervent manner in which he expressed his intention to return the paper, I went home for it, and did indulge his curiosity.

"BUT

"But, instead of keeping his promise, he and Alderman Kerrison, after retiring from the room for some minutes, returned, and the Major offered to me not the original, but a copy only. I urged the unfairness and impropriety of this breach of promise, but ineffectually. When I found that I could not prevail upon him to return what he had so fraudulently obtained, I told him, I hoped that he would make no improper use of it. Upon which Alderman Kerrison remarked, "that to be sure Major Money would never be such a fool as to expose himself by the publication of it."

"To the truth of the above narrative I set my hand this 27th day of December, 1787.

Witness

PETER GEDGE, sen."

ROBERT SUTTON.

THE truth of this solemn assertion, Mr. M. in a public advertisement, which he has subsequently addressed to Sir Thomas Beevor, does not attempt to deny, or indeed even to palliate, but artfully evades the question, by observing, that he shall for the present, "take pattern by Sir Thomas Beevor," and exert that prudence, which hitherto he has seemed totally to set at defiance; and although publicly accused of a breach of his word, consoles himself with the reflection

reflection, that it is quite sufficient for him that "Mr. Alderman Kerrison*" was present during the transaction.

HERE indeed Mr. Money has manifested a degree of prudent caution worthy of himself: for upon examination, I do not perceive that Sir Thomas Beevor has *pledged* himself to carry this matter into a court of law.—All that appears to me is, his observation, that he is *advised* to have it thoroughly investigated there.—It may be, that when Mr. M. aimed his blow, he was himself so securely intrenched behind the "mud-works, the briars, and brambles of sophistry," as to be impregnable, in a court of law, for what, in *foro conscientiae*, he would have been universally condemned.—If so, Sir Thomas Beevor would be miserably deserted indeed by his prudence, was he to attack an adversary so intrenched; and consequently, Mr. M. if he should wait for that event, would avoid the *onus probandi*, that Mr. Gedge's assertion is not founded upon the basis of veracity. But, however this paper might be acquired, so thoroughly convinced was Mr. M. that Sir Thomas Beevor was the author of it, that he sent a note that

* In the advertisement published in the London papers, the sanction of this name was adopted; but for some reason or other, the word "Gentleman" superceded it in the Norwich papers, probably for the laudable purpose of a more striking contrast with Sir Thomas Beevor's friend the "Butcher."

evening to Hethel, *modestly* requesting that the Baronet would give himself the trouble of coming to Norwich, merely to indulge the capricious fancy of an individual, about an imaginary insult.—Sir Thomas Beevor was in London, for which place Mr. Money (as he says) *immediately* set off.—Unfortunately however for his memory, he did not set off *immediately for London*.—It is true, upon the first curious discovery of the hand-writing, this second Daniel did throw himself into a post-chaise, and set off from Norwich,—but—it was, for the purpose of composing his injured feelings in the softer pleasures of a Ball*, and of moderating his “uncommon wrath” by a sacrifice at Beauty’s shrine.

It is natural, however, to suppose that he atoned by an additional share of activity in the prosecution of his journey next day, for his dilatoriness on the former.—No;—another, and another came, and still this *immediate* journey did not take place until the 2d of November.

WHEN he arrived in London, he wrote the following letter to Sir Thomas Beevor:

* At Blickling, the seat of the Earl of Buckinghamshire.

" To Sir THOMAS BEEVOR.

Jack's Coffee-house, Dean-street,

" S I R,

Soho, Nov. 4, 1787.

" A MOST infamous libel upon my character, dated Norwich, October 25, 1787, appeared in the Bury Paper, and another still more atrocious, I am told, was written for the same Paper, of both of these I am informed, to my astonishment, that Sir Thomas Beevor is the author. As I know that much misinformation arises in life, I beg to know from yourself, whether there is any truth in either of the above assertions. Before I take any resolution in this business, I pay you the compliment of making this previous inquiry.

And am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

JOHN MONEY.

" P. S. Captain Lofack, of the Navy, will do me the favour of delivering this to you, and will be the bearer of your answer, should he be fortunate enough to meet with you: but should that not be the case, he will deliver this into the hands of Mr. Lowten, your attorney, who will, no doubt, transmit it to you; and I trust, I shall receive your immediate answer."

THIS letter, Sir Thomas Beevor did not receive till the 7th, as will appear by his answer to it.

" To

" To MAJOR MONEY.

Will's Coffee-house, Lincoln's-Inn,

" S I R,

Nov. 7, 1787.

" I HAVE this instant received from the hands of Mr. Lowten, the letter addressed to me by you. I thank you for the compliment of making the inquiry, as you have done relative to what you term *libels* upon your character. The paper which appeared in the Bury Paper, of the date you mention, if you mean that signed Lowden, I never saw till it was published, and knew no more of, than any other reader of that paper. The other paper which you term more atrocious, I must first see, and know the contents of, before I can possibly acknowledge, or deny myself the author of it. I have been from home so long, that I know no more of the business you write about, than what you mention in your letter; so that you must excuse my being more explicit at present, than in adding, that I have never been the author of any *libel* upon your character. I leave this place to-day, as my business is nearly compleated; when you return to Norfolk, if you wish for further explanation, you may then receive it.

I am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

THOMAS BEEVOR."

Now it appears rather extraordinary that Mr. Money should not, at this stage of the business, have endeavoured to have seen Sir Thomas Beevor, instead of sending by his friend, Captain Lofack, so laconic an epistle: had he pursued that line of conduct; it might, in all probability, have been the means of preventing the disagreeable consequences that have since ensued;—but a war of paper seems in this instance to have been the primary object to Mr. M. altho' even in that, he did not manifest all the adroitness which might naturally have been expected upon such an occasion.—Sir Thomas Beevor arrived at Hethel on the 8th, on which day Mr. M. left London, and came as far as Barton Mills, where he quitted the stage coach, and did not arrive at home until a subsequent day.—On the 11th of November he wrote the following letter:

“ To Sir THOMAS BEEVOR.

Trowse, Nov. 11, 1787.

“ S I R,

I WAS favored with your letter from Will's Coffee-house, dated November the 7th, by which you assure me, you have never wrote a libel against my character. As we may differ in our ideas, on what is, and what is not a libel, I now beg to know, whether you are the author of the original

ginal paper (of which the inclosed is a copy*)—An explicit answer will oblige,

Sir, your humble servant,

JOHN MONEY."

THIS letter was answered on the 12th.

" To MAJOR MONEY.

" S I R,

Hethel, Nov. 12, 1787.

" I HAVE received the paper inclosed to me, in your letter of this day, and see no reason why I should give you any other answer to the question proposed than that, whether I am, or am not the author, seems to be of no consequence to you; unless you acknowledge, that what is there said, of some real or imaginary person, belongs to yourself, and only to yourself.

* The Editor has forbore to insert the farrago of nonsense, the application of which, Mr. Money, by his extraordinary procedure, has so virtually assumed to himself, lest he should appear rather as aiming at the exposition of his character, than the justification of Sir Thomas Beevor's:—but in compliance with the public wishes, he here formerly calls upon Mr. Money for the publication of it; in order that the invariable opinion of his disingenuity may be diminished, which at present prevails, from his suppression of an indefinite anonymous squib, after having so sagaciously converted it into a libel, and accused so respectable a character as Sir Thomas Beevor, with having been the author of it.

" I

" I AM informed, you have been told that it is the production of another person ; and there does certainly appear to me in the description of the character, which you seem to interest yourself so much about, many parts that most people must think cannot be applied to you. Why then put on any man's cap but your own? Since in doing so, you become the libeller alone.

I am, Sir, your's, &c.

T. BEEVOR."

ON the 13th came another letter from Mr. Money, which, whatever might have been his provocation, did no great credit, in point of style, either to his expression, or his feelings.

" To Sir THOMAS BEEVOR.

" S I R,

Trowse, Nov. 13, 1787.

" I RECEIVED your letter last night, which I hoped would have been an explicit answer to mine : on the contrary, it is ambiguous and evasive.

I SHALL not enter into refinements with you on the subject of libels ; therefore, shall only say, that the original paper (a copy of which I sent you yesterday) is so far a libel on my character, that the printer of a Norwich Paper refused

fused publishing it, and it was brought to me for that reason. I shall only add, that the author is a *cowardly, base, illiberal-minded villain*. You have been, Sir, misinformed, I never was told it was the production of any man but Sir Thomas Beevor.

" I AM this day going to Swaffham, and on my return, shall be glad to have an interview with you on the subject.

I am, Sir, your's, &c.

J. MONEY,"

To this, under the first impulse of resentment (as may be presumed) Sir Thomas Beevor returned the following answer;

" To MAJOR MONEY,

" S I R, *Tuesday Evening, Nov. 13.*

" THE gross and illiberal language of your letter, shews you to be no Gentleman. It is impossible that you can have been ever told, that I was the author of what you please to call a libel upon your character. No man on earth could say it to you, as no man knows it to be so; and I will now never condescend to gratify your *curiosity* on that head. Your reflections affect him only; and I shall once for all add, that I neither wish for interview, or further
corres-

correspondence with you; and that if you think yourself injured, you may seek that remedy from law, which I am told, you have already enquired after; and that I shall so far follow the example you have set me in this instance, that I shall certainly avail myself of the same assistance, if by your future conduct in this affair, you should choose to give me any reason to do it.

T. BEEVOR."

It is observable, that Mr. M. says in his letter, he is going to Swaffham on the 13th, whereas it is notorious he did not arrive there until the 16th, and even after having spent one day there, instead of returning speedily to vindicate his injured honour, he absented himself from home, as will appear by his letter of the 3d of December, for more than a fortnight.

WHAT must have been Sir Thomas Beevor's sentiments of a man, who under the particular circumstances which Mr. M. described himself to have been, could yet, by an unaccountable appearance of indifference, neglect, or procrastinate an affair which required his immediate and serious attention.—Could it be supposed, that the phlegmatic wish which was expressed for an interview on his return from Swaffham, was intended to have been an inimical

inimical one?—It is impossible that such a supposition could for a moment have entered Sir Thomas Beevor's head; and, as far as my opinion may be allowed to decide, it was not then the intention of the other.

BUT a sort of cautious wariness appears to have marked all Mr. M.'s steps in the prosecution of this affair.

ON the 3d of December he wrote that memorable anonymous letter, which, in point of composition, politeness, and classical erudition, will stand as a lasting memento of his judgement and liberality of sentiment, long after he shall be no more; and which in a subsequent publication he has so *ingeniously* acknowledged to have been his hand-writing, altho' immediately previous he has apprised the public, that there were *obvious reasons* for the omission of his name; and then seems to exult in the sagacious discovery, that, "by the hand-writing an author may be known." This conclusion he logically infers from the circumstance of Sir Thomas Beevor's having written an answer to that curious epistle; not reflecting, that without any violent exertion of the intellectual powers, Sir Thomas Beevor could impute such a composition to no one else, except himself; it being nothing more than a continuation of a private correspondence between two individuals, which could not possibly be mistaken.

D

" To

" To Sir THOMAS BEEVOR.

" S I R,

December 3, 1787.

" I HAVE been absent from home some time, or you would have had an answer to your letter of the 13th of November, notwithstanding you wish to have no further correspondence with me. Your conduct, Sir, in the business, depending between us, has been so artful, so insidious, so evasive, and ensnaring, that I have been much puzzled what course to take with a man of your description. Give me a plain answer to a plain question, and I shall know what to do. You entrench yourself behind the briars and brambles, and the mud-works of sophistry. I sent you a copy of a paper-writing, intended for a newspaper; but the printer seeing the drift of it, would not publish it, and he gave it to me as the person whom it was to injure. I told you, that the author is a cowardly, base, and illiberal-minded villain. In answer you tell me, " it is impossible any man should mention yourself as the author, *because no man knows it.*" I can believe the latter part of this assertion, because I am well aware, that if Sir Thomas Beevor aims a blow, his prudence will direct him to do it in the most clandestine manner. But, Sir, tho' no man saw you write the libel in question, there may be circumstances that lead to the conclusion that " you are the man:"

I re-

I repeat once more, that Sir Thomas Beevor has been mentioned to me as the author, and no other person whatever. Your own heart can tell you, that you are, or are not the author. Instead of giving a direct answer, you have recourse to paltry chicane and little evasion, such as "there are parts of the writing which does not relate to me, and if I take it to myself, I make the *libel*." Is not this too frivolous for any man of common sense? By such artifices, you become the apologist for that pest of society, a *clandestine libeller*. You add, that, "you have been informed, I have had recourse to the law." It is not true, Sir Thomas: I have sought no legal advice, nor is it the law that gives you any apprehension; for you know that libellers may be reformed in that more classical way mentioned by Horace, *formidine fustis*. Answer my question, Sir, and I assure you, that your name shall never be brought by me into any court of law. There is an example for you to follow; say the same on your part, and say at the same time, *are you a libeller or not?* If you will not throw off from yourself so vile an imputation, let it stick by you,—be considered in the country as the wretch, who is capable of being the dark assassin of his neighbour's reputation. If you submit to this character, I leave you for the present, to the infamy of it. What future steps I may take, will

depend upon your future conduct. Till you satisfy my enquiry, I cannot subscribe myself

Your humble servant,

THIS master-piece of perfection drew from Sir Thomas Beevor his letter of the 9th of December.

“ To MAJOR MONEY:

“ S I R,

Hethel, Dec. 9; 1787.

“ THOUGH I meant not to have given any further answer to you, respecting the paper you sent me, and I find myself still less inclined to do it after the very scurrilous anonymous letter I received on Wednesday last, yet, as the indiscretion of a printer* has brought the transaction betwixt us not very correctly before the public, I have therefore thought proper to take notice of the same, through a similar channel, in order to clear my character to that public, from the charge you have most unjustly brought against

* Alluding to a paragraph (copied from a London paper) that appeared in the Bury and Norwich Post of December 5; the printer of which paper, who resides at Bury, being at that time entirely ignorant of what had passed on the subject between his father and Mr. Money, at Norwich.—EDIT.

it. The letter I first wrote to you was fully explicit, and said the same which you will find said by me in Mr. Crouse's paper of last Saturday; and had you not illiberally called for further explanation from me, in a manner which I thought bore the face of menace, I should, when we had met, have readily given you any further explanation of the affair. I am told you have consulted the Marquis Townshend on this occasion, and report says, that you declare that you have acted wholly by his advice. This seems to me to be so very unlikely, that I cannot believe it, till it is confirmed by yourself. I wish therefore to know from you, if this be true, and I shall be ready, if you be not now fully satisfied on the subject, to meet you before that tribunal, where, I am sure, no one can doubt of a just and honourable judgment. You must be sensible, Sir, after the more than common pains you seem to have taken to make this affair known to almost every body here, before it was communicated to me, you really left me no choice of conduct; and that I did observe no other than I have hitherto done, was wholly owing to the improper steps which you had taken. I have neither leisure nor disposition to recapitulate the farrago of epithets bestowed on my letters, in the above-mentioned anonymous performance; nor would I so much dishonour myself, as to return them. But to give your classical friend, who so kindly helped you to a scrap from Horace,

Horace, a more just idea of me, I would observe, that besides the reason given in Mr. *Crouse's* paper, there was a much more probable and obvious one for my not owning myself the author of the paper complained of; which was much less flattering to you, than that which he has been pleased to assign.

THOMAS BEEVOR."

It is to be lamented, that after the declaration of Sir Thomas Beevor, not to take any further notice of Mr. Money, or his letters, he should have abandoned so laudable a resolution, and have condescended to return any answer to his last scurrilous and rhapsodical composition.—But Sir Thomas Beevor is a man; has the feelings of a man; and whatsoever his reason might have suggested to him upon the occasion, yet, it is not much to be wondered at, that passion at such a period should have prevailed against it.

Here ended this extraordinary correspondence.—Since which, some observations have appeared in public; particularly in a sensible letter, addressed to Sir Thomas Beevor, in the *Norfolk Chronicle*, of the 5th of January, 1788; where the author has treated his subject in so ingenious and masterly a manner, as to make it highly unnecessary for me

to touch on those features, which he has so happily delineated*.

Now, after Sir Thomas Beevor had declared, not only, that he was *not* the author of the first paper signed Lowden, but moreover, that he had *never* been the author of *any* libel on the character of Mr. Money, what right could Mr. Money plead in defence of his demand for any other reply? The word of a gentleman ought fully to have satisfied his mind, and any further inquisition into the matter could only be considered in the light of an insult on the good sense and veracity of Sir Thomas Beevor; and undoubtedly justified him in his enquiry, whether Mr. Money acknowledged himself to be the object of the ridiculous paper, which he

* In the concluding passage of the letter above alluded to, the writer takes notice of Mr. Money's observation (in p. 25 of his pamphlet) on a passage in Sir Thomas Beevor's last letter, where he says, 'he had reasons for not owning himself the author of the paper in question;' which, Mr. M. says, more than implied that he was the author.—"Now, I observe," says this writer, "the words of Sir T. B.'s letter are, 'that *besides* the reason given in Mr. Crouse's paper (which was that he was not the author of the paper which is supposed to have given offence) there was a much more probable and obvious one for his not owning himself the author of the paper complained of; which was much less flattering to him (Mr. M.) than that which he has been pleased to assign.'—What Sir T. B. meant by this hint (continues the author of this letter) is best known to himself; but it was very apparent to me, and to many others, that contempt, and not fear of him, determined Sir T. B. not to satisfy his curiosity."

had

had inclosed to him in his letter of November 11, and with the contents of which he seemed to be so highly offended.

It might, perhaps, not improperly be asked, what would have been the conduct of a prudent man upon his obtaining possession of so gross and contemptible a performance? Such an one would doubtless have consigned its contents to oblivion, by a silent contempt for its author. But, on the contrary, what course did Mr. Money pursue? Why, after having surreptitiously gained possession of the *original*, he ingeniously gave back a *copy*; by which extraordinary manœuvre, together with his subsequent conduct, he excited the public curiosity, and became thereby his own calumniator; as there is now scarcely an individual in the county who is unacquainted with its general tendency.

THERE appears to me nothing extraordinary, that one hand-writing, how particular soever it may be, should resemble another.—Surely, therefore, this was not a sufficient cause of accusation, and of accusation too, conveyed in such gross and illiberal language, as would almost induce one to discredit the fact, unless it had been authenticated by the sanction of a signature.

Mr.

Mr. M. does not want to be informed, that whatever the disputes between gentlemen may be, a dignity of character, and refinement of language, are the few predominant features which should distinguish them from the lowest orders of human society. With what pretension then, after his treatment of Sir Thomas Beevor, can he expect from him, or indeed from any one who is acquainted with this affair, that respect and good opinion, to which, otherwise, he might probably have been entitled. But, if he supposes that he has even a right to set all decorum aside, and to despise the opinion of the world, at least, let him endeavour to observe some kind of *consistency* in his behaviour. How far he has been guided by this rule, will appear by a consideration of his reflections on Sir Thomas Beevor.—He tells him, that, “when he strikes a blow, his prudence will direct him to do it in the most clandestine manner; that he entrenches himself behind the briars and brambles, and mud-works of sophistry.”—How then, is this, according to Mr. M.’s own declaration, to be reconciled to the circumstance under our discussion. Either Sir Thomas Beevor is not possessed of that prudence of which he is *accused*, or the argument of Mr. M. is inconclusive and absurd.

Every body who has seen this, will be of opinion that it is

Is it reasonable to suppose, that, if Sir Thomas Beevor could be what Mr. M. would fain represent him, he would have been so totally destitute of common sense as to trust out of his possession an instrument, which it was far from being improbable, might rise up in judgement against him? This circumstance alone, is, in my opinion, the strongest presumptive proof in the world (next to his assertion to the contrary) that he was not the author. — But that either an accidental or *wilful* advantage hath been taken of the ability to resemble Sir Thomas Beevor's hand-writing, by some incautious individual, or malevolent partizan; and that Mr. M. has been the person who has inadvertently, or otherwise, carried the purpose into execution. I mean not to express, nor do I wish any ill will to Mr. M. for I never received from him the most distant provocation; but truth demands from me this tribute of defence; and the appeal which he hath so solemnly made to the public tribunal, justifies me amply in the unconstrained opinion which I have given. Why did not Mr. M. boldly, and independently step forward and ask an explanation from Sir Thomas Beevor, and not screen himself behind the arras of an epistolary correspondence? Had he done that, from my knowledge of the candour and philanthropy of Sir Thomas Beevor's character, all the present mortifying and disgraceful circumstances would have been avoided, which now, I

fear,

scar, will for a long time adhere to, and tarnish the complexion of Mr. M.'s character.

THE artful pretence of delicacy in the suppression of that nobleman's name, to whom Sir Thomas Beevor was willing to refer the cause, from a conviction of his ability to prove his rectitude, must convey to the minds of the disinterested reader a thorough demonstration of the aim which was intended. What plausible reason could Mr. M. have to suppress the name of the Marquis Townshend, at the same instant that he was inhumanly sporting with that of Sir Thomas Beevor, and endeavouring to consign his character to eternal infamy?

HAD Sir Thomas Beevor *improperly* appealed to so respectable a personage, there might have existed the *shadow* of a reason for such a conduct; but when nothing else was intended but a fair appeal to a mutual friend, whose opinion was supposed to have been equal to a decision upon the subject,—was not a suppression of the name of that friend ungenerous and invidious?

LET the public eye, divested of partiality and party-prejudice, be for a moment adverted to the general conduct of Sir Thomas Beevor; let it examine attentively the various

rious and relative duties which he has discharged throughout an advanced life, both as a magistrate and a friend; and then, upon cool reflection, determine whether this last attack upon his character has not been unjustifiable and cruel.

WHAT opinion must a candid and disinterested public have of a cause which is endeavoured to be upheld by arguments, that in effect, so evidently tend to its confutation? Does Mr. M. presume to imagine that the world will be so blind to the dictates of common sense, as to impute that as a crime to Sir T. B. which is, in fact, his greatest ornament? If he is, or (as is artfully insinuated) would appear to be a character of eminence in the county, he deserves rather the tribute of public encomium, as aiming at that character, which it is the duty of every virtuous and good citizen to aspire to.

BUT, has not the aim also of Mr. M. been, unremittingly through life, to render himself a conspicuous object of public notice? Is it not notorious to the most superficial observer, that upon every occasion which has offered, he has *endeavoured* to distinguish himself?—What methods, indeed, he has adopted to this desirable end, or how far he has succeeded in them, I leave to others to decide.

I WILL

I will grant, Sir Thomas Beever may have his faults ; and, in this unstable condition of humanity, who is there that is free from them ? *Nemo sine peccatis nascitur, optimus ille qui minimis urgetur.* Ingratitude, however, to an old and established friendship is not to be ranked amongst them. But can Mr. M. demonstrate that he hath observed an unflinching obedience to the various duties of his station ? Can he boast a life unfulfilled by actions which morality would condemn ? Let him make an intuitive examination of himself ; and if Conscience doth not make a coward of him, let him then come forward, and cast the first stone. But if otherwise, let him retire into obscurity, and yield in future that tributary respect and admiration which is due to the superior talents and merit of Sir Thomas Beever.

F I N I S.

I will grant, Sir Thomas Brown, that
and in this unhappy condition of things, who is better
there is no room for them? I have the greatest of them, and
all the same in nature. In practice, however, to be old
and established friendship is not to be treated as such;
them. But Sir Thomas Brown, I am sure, is not the only
an unwilling obedience to the various duties of his station?
Can he bear a little more of the duties which morality
would condemn? I am sure, Sir, that in his private
of himself, and in his public life, he is not a coward of
him, let him then come forward, and call the first step.
But if otherwise, let him retire into obscurity, and yield in
thane that a luxury respect and admiration which is due to
the superior talents and merits of Sir Thomas Brown.

P I N I S

